

REMARKS

Initially, in the Office Action dated July 2, 2003, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 12 and 20 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,073,075 (Kondou et al.). Claims 3, 4, 13, 15-17, 21 and 23-25 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondou et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,743 (Pu et al.). Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondou et al. in view of Pu et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,565 (Tyra et al.). Claims 6-11, 14, 18, 19, 22, 26 and 27 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondou et al. in view of Pu et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,173,316 (De Boor et al.).

By the present response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 12, and 20 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-27 remain pending in the present application.

892 form Missing reference

Applicants note that the Examiner has still failed to provide an initialed PTO Form 892 with the Tyra et al. reference as requested in Applicants previous Amendment. Applicants again respectfully request the Examiner submit an initialed PTO Form 892 form with this reference listed as having been examined by the Examiner.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 12 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kondou et al. These are the same rejections asserted by the Examiner in the previous Office Action. Applicants reassert all arguments submitted

in Applicants' previous response to this rejection. Moreover, Applicants submit the following additional remarks.

Kondou et al. discloses that some data is transmitted in real-time, i.e. when the car moves from one place to another so that the car is always on the map. The car in real-time updates its location information on the server side which sends the correct piece of map to the mobile terminal. In contrast, the present invention is related to the change at the content provider server. If the server is updated due to the change in, e.g. a hockey game situation, then the update is sent to the terminal. The current content or its parameter in the display of the terminal is sent to the server to compare whether any change has occurred. If a change is found, the new content or its parts are sent to the terminal (see Applicants' specification, page 11, lines 5-15). According to the present invention, a server records information regarding what one or more terminals are displaying. The server monitors whether update information is available and if so, sends the update information to the appropriate terminal so that the terminal may update the display to correspond to the new information. For example, if a particular user terminal is displaying one or more hockey games that are currently being played, the server may monitor if a goal comes or some other change, and then send this update information to the user terminal so the user terminal can update the particular display (hockey game) associated with the updated information. Other displayed hockey games at the same user terminal may not have updates. According to the present invention, the user terminal may display different information and receive updates from different servers related to the different information being displayed. In contrast, Kondou et

al. discloses the terminal receiving and displaying only one type of information, location information, from one server.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Kondou et al. does not disclose or suggest receiving information from one or more content providers, displaying a portion of the information on the one or more user terminals, monitoring information from one or more content providers to determine if any of the portions of the information being displayed at the one or more user terminals has changed, or transmitting only the information that has changed from the particular content provider to the particular user terminal where the user terminal is capable of displaying different information from different content providers simultaneously. Kondou et al. is solely limited to a mobile terminal receiving information on the destination area from a database. Kondou et al. does not disclose or suggest the mobile terminal receiving information or update information that is different, or receiving this different information from different servers, or displaying the different information simultaneously, as recited in the claims of the present application. As shown in Fig. 3 of Kondou et al., one traffic information center 24 supplies one or more mobile terminals 20 with traffic information only.

The other cited references also fail to disclose or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application. For example, Pu et al. describes a navigation system that uses map and position information to generate a best driving route. Tyra et al. describes a generic system for communication between computers and devices with support for different messaging models. DeBoor et al. discloses a way to access phones functionally with the help of some mark-up language. None of

these references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of the claims of the present application of receiving information from at least one content provider, displaying a portion on at least one user terminal, monitoring information from the at least one content provider to determine if any portion has changed, or transmitting only the information from the content provider that has changed to an appropriate user terminal where each user terminal is capable of displaying different information from different content providers simultaneously.

Regarding claim 2, Applicants submit that claim 2 is dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Kondou et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of claims 1, 2, 12 and 20 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

35 USC §103 Rejections

Claims 3, 4, 13, 15-17, 21 and 23-25 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondou et al. in view of Pu et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants submit that claims 3, 4, 13, 15-17, 21 and 23-25 are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 12 and 20 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. Applicants

submit that Pu et al. does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Kondou et al.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that neither Kondou et al. nor Pu et al., taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 3, 4, 13, 15-17, 21 and 23-25 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondou et al. in view of Pu et al. and further in view of Tyra et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants submit that claim 5 is dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding this independent claim. Applicants submit that neither Pu et al. nor Tyra et al., taken alone or in combination, overcome the significant defects noted previously regarding Kondou et al. Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 5 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Claims 6-11, 14, 18, 19, 22, 26 and 27 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondou et al. in view of Pu et al. and further in view of De Boor et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants submit that claims 7-11, 14, 18, 19, 22 and 26-27 are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 12 and 20 and, therefore, are patentable at least for

the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. Applicants submit that neither Pu et al. nor De Boor et al., taken alone or in combination, overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Kondou et al. Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 6-11, 14, 18, 19, 22, 26 and 27 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-27 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (referencing attorney docket no. 0171.38083X00).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

FDB/sdb
(703) 312-6600